ISSN 0228 - 7048

Ontario

Ministry of
Transportation and
Communications

Research and
Development
Division

Reliability Analysis of Track Bound Transit Systems

RR 231



Ontario

Ministry of
Transportation and
Communications

Research and
Development
Division

Reliability Analysis of Track Bound Transit Systems

C. Singh
Senior Research Officer
Transport and Vehicle Systems
Research and Development Branch

TVS – TR – 80 – 122

ISBN 0 - 7743 - 6025 - 9

Published by
The Ministry of Transportation and
Communications, Ontario
Hon. James W. Snow, Minister
H.F. Gilbert, Deputy Minister

Produced by Technology Transfer,
Research and Development Branch
Policy Planning and Research Division.

Contents of this report may be reproduced,
whole or in part, with attribution to
the Ministry.

Copies may be obtained by writing to:
The Editor
Research and Development Branch
Ministry of Transportation and
Communications
1201 Wilson Avenue
Downsview, Ontario
M3M 1J8

First Printing, September, 1980

Abstract

The development of reliability models for track-bound transit systems is described in this report. Models for components such as vehicles and passenger stations are discussed; and the method of combining these models to obtain the reliability indices of the transit system is described. The vehicle model includes the effect of total and partial failure types, retrieval, and repair times. This model is then used to develop the model for the vehicle fleet, including the effect of spare vehicles and of vehicles on maintenance. The number of vehicles in a fleet is, generally, large. The model, therefore, tends to be computationally tedious. The full model is reduced using the concept of equivalent transition rate and the associated equations are given in this report.

Several degraded modes of operation are possible for a complex transit system. The reliability indices for various levels of performance are, therefore, derived. The system based reliability measures used are the probability, frequency, and mean duration of states of interest. Some demand based measures are also discussed and they reflect the delay incurred or travel time lost by the passengers or vehicles. The reliability models provide a useful tool for the analysis of design configurations, performing sensitivity studies, and assessing the number of spare vehicles.

Some studies on a hypothetical system are also described in this report. These studies include the effect of variation in mean time to failure and repair on the reliability measures of the system and the effect of having spare vehicles. The work contained in this report was carried out primarily in the period 1973-74.

Contents

1/Introduction	1
1.1/General	1
1.2/System Configuration	1
2/Basic Theory	2
2.1/General	2
2.2/State Space Approach	2
2.3/Measures of Reliability	2
2.3.1/System Based Measures	2
2.3.2/Demand Based Measures	3
3/Vehicle System Model	5
3.1/General	5
3.2/Vehicle Model	5
3.3/Vehicle System Model	6
3.4/Reduced Vehicle System Model	8
3.5/Solution for State Probabilities and Reliability Measures	9
3.6/Vehicle System Example	10
4/System Model for Trains	14
5/Passenger Station Model	14
5.1/Model for a Single Station	14
5.2/Model for System of Stations	15
6/Models for Other Subsystems	19
6.1/Power Substations Model	19
6.2/Guideway Model	19
6.3/Command and Control System Model	19
7/Total System Model	20
7.1/System Based Reliability Measures	20
7.2/Reliability Measures Including Demand	21
8/System Studies	24
8.1/Sensitivity of Reliability Indices to the Vehicle MTBF (Retrieval Mode)	24
8.2/Sensitivity of Reliability Indices to the Mean Time to Repair a Vehicle (MTTR)	25
8.3/Effect of Spare Vehicles	26
8.4/Effect of Entraining Vehicles	26
9/Concluding Remarks	27
9.1/Effect of Peak and Off-Peak Periods	27
9.2/Simulation versus Analytical Method	27
9.3/Failure Data	27
9.4/Further Work	27
10/References	28
11/Notation	28

1/ Introduction

1.1/General

Reliability is a very important consideration in the planning, design, and operation of track-bound transit systems. The term "track-bound" is used here to describe systems whose vehicles are captive on a common track. This includes steel wheel on steel rail, rubber wheel on concrete guideway, and magnetically levitated vehicles. In the case of a road system, the failure of a vehicle may cause some delay to the other vehicles but the effect on the system is more or less localized, since the failed vehicle can be pulled to the side or bypassed by the other vehicles. The bypass capability of track-bound systems, on the other hand, is extremely limited. The failure of a single vehicle in such systems could affect or immobilize the upstream vehicles and, depending upon network configuration, the degrading or immobilizing effect could spread over the entire system. This serial effect makes reliability a particularly important consideration in track-bound transit systems.

Reliability is important for both the transit operator and the passengers. Lower reliability means increased unscheduled maintenance and decreased equipment availability. If availability is low, more vehicles are needed to meet the passenger demand; but even with more vehicles, system performance may not be satisfactory. More vehicles can increase system availability but will not decrease the incidence of system failures. Reliability is important to passengers as it reflects the ability of a transit system to keep operating schedules.

Traditionally, the transit operators have relied on warranties to assure the procurement of reliable equipment. The warranties are, however, more like maintenance or service contracts and do not necessarily serve as deterrents to system unreliability. Under a typical warranty, the manufacturer pays for repairs during a limited period of time. Once the warranty period is over, however, unreliability becomes the headache of the transit operator. Many operators now realize that economical reliability can be built into the systems only during the design, development, and manufacturing stage of the equipment. The emphasis now appears to be shifting towards specifying reliability targets and implementing reliability assurance programs during design and development. Reliability models provide a useful tool for the analysis of design configurations. This report describes reliability models for the components of a transit system and then the techniques of combining these models to derive the reliability measures of the entire system.

1.2/System Configuration

The models were originally developed for a specific system application in which the track was a single loop (Figure 1) with off-line stations. From the viewpoint of reliability modelling, this configuration can be generally regarded equivalent to a single two-way route in which the vehicles move on one track in one direction and at the terminal station they are switched onto the other track for the opposite direction. The methodology illustrated by these models can be employed to develop models for more individual applications.

A transit system consists of the following subsystems:

1. Vehicle fleet
2. Passenger stations
3. Substations for power supply
4. Command and control
5. Guideway

These subsystems, in turn, may be divided into what will be termed components in this report. Models for each subsystem are described herein.



Figure 1/A Single Loop

2/Basic Theory

2.1/General

The models in this report consider the total and partial failure modes of the vehicle, the spare vehicles, and vehicles on maintenance. These models are then combined with the models for the other subsystems. There is a considerable statistical dependence between the various modes of failure, repair, retrieval, and maintenance. The state space approach [1,2] has, therefore, been used in developing these models.

2.2/State Space Approach

In this approach, the possible states of the system (state space) and the modes of transiting from one state to another are identified. Each mode of interstate transition is assigned a specific value called its interstate transition rate. The state equations can be written using the frequency balancing approach [1]. The frequency of transiting from state i to state j is defined as the expected transition rate from state i to state j and is given by $P_i\lambda_{ij}$. The frequency balancing approach states that the rate of change of the probability of being in state i equals the frequency of transiting into state i from all the remaining states minus the frequency of transiting out of state i, that is:

$$\sum_j P_j(t)\,\lambda_{ji} - P_i(t)\sum_j \lambda_{ij} = \dot{P}_i(t) \qquad (2.1)$$

In the equilibrium condition, $\dot{P}_i(t) = 0$ and therefore Equation 2.1 reduces to:

$$\sum_j P_j\,\lambda_{ji} - P_i \sum_j \lambda_{ij} = 0 \qquad (2.2)$$

In other words, the frequency of encountering state i equals the frequency of encountering the rest of state space from state i. For n states there are n equations and they are linearly dependent, i.e., any equation can be obtained from the remaining (n - 1) equations. Any (n - 1) equations together with the total probability equation

$$\sum P_i = 1$$

can be solved to obtain the state probabilities. These state probabilities can be used to obtain the reliability measures.

The number of states tends to be large due to the size and complexity of the transit system. The models can be reduced using the concept of equivalent transition rate [1]. The equivalent transition rate under the equilibrium condition is given by:

$\lambda^e_{X^- X^+}$ = the equivalent transition rate from subset X^- to subset X^+.

$$= \sum_{i\in X^-}\sum_{j\in X^+} P_i\,\lambda_{ij} \Big/ \sum_{i\in X^-} P_i \qquad (2.3)$$

The other techniques used for keeping the number of states within manageable limits are state space truncation and sequential truncation [1]. These techniques consist of systematically deleting states with relatively low probabilities.

2.3/Measures of Reliability

Transit systems, like other commercial or public systems, are designed to meet a certain demand. Therefore, the reliability of transit systems can be viewed in two ways. One way of looking at reliability is in terms of the system deficiencies. The measures relating to this approach are termed "system based reliability measures". (The "system" is comprised of hardware, software, and the human interface — although in most of the reliability studies only hardware and computer based software (if any) are considered.) It is desirable to know how system deficiencies relate to the inability of the system to satisfy the demand and the corresponding measures, which are the second way of looking at reliability, are called the "demand based reliability measures". Obviously, both of these measures are interrelated.

2.3.1/System Based Measures

Reliability indices are usually defined in the available literature in terms of success or failure. However, many complex systems such as transit systems or electric power systems have several levels of failure and it is, therefore, appropriate to define the calculated reliability measures in terms of subset X^+ which may contain a specific number of system states. This subset defines an event or a particular mode of degradation of the system. The various modes or levels of system degradation can, therefore, be represented by suitably defining the elements of X^+. As an example, X^+ may be used to represent the system states having the number of available vehicles less than a specified number or the number of failed passenger stations greater than a particular number. The following measures defined on X^+ have been used in this report.

1/Probability of X^+

This can be defined as the limiting value of the time spent in X^+ as a fraction of the total operating time and is given by:

$$P_+ = \sum_{i\in X^+} P_i \qquad (2.4)$$

2/*Frequency of Encountering X^+*
This is the mean number of occurrences of X^+ per unit of the operating time and can be calculated with the following formula taken from Reference 1:

$$f_+ = \sum_{j \in X^-} P_j \sum_{i \in X^+} \lambda_{ji} \qquad (2.5)$$

3/*Mean Cycle Time of X^+*
This is the mean time between successive encounters of X^+ and equals the reciprocal of f_+:

$$T_+ = 1/f_+ \qquad (2.6)$$

4/*Mean Duration of X^+*
This is the expected time of stay in X^+ in one cycle (one cycle consititutes X^+ and X^-) and is given by:

$$d_+ = P_+/f_+ = P_+T_+ \qquad (2.7)$$

2.3.2/Demand Based Measures
The primary purpose of a transit system is to move passengers between the various points of a network. It is, therefore, important to have a measure of reliability as perceived by the passengers. As an example, [3], consider a Jeep having an MTBF of approximately 260 h [4]. If this vehicle were driven on the average for 48 km (30 mi.) a day at an average speed of 24 km/h (15 mph), the average interval between two failures would be 130 d (calendar days); whereas this interval, in terms of operating time, would be only about 11 d.

Coming back to transit systems, consider a system which breaks down on an average of every 15 d with an average down time duration of 0.5 h. A passenger who travels for only say 15 min twice a day, will not be affected by every system failure. Assuming uniform service level of 16 h/d operation, he may be affected on the average approximately by every seventh failure and, therefore, he will tend to see the system failing on the average approximately three times a year.

The perception of the failure is further affected by several factors such as whether the delay must be tolerated in a comfortable, airconditioned environment or in a hot, stuffy vehicle, and by the personal temperament of the passenger. Media reports and stories of system failures told by other passengers add something to the direct exposure to failures. The threshold for the tolerance of delay also depends upon the system reliability to which the passengers have been accustomed. It can be appreciated that it is extremely difficult to measure or predict the passengers' perception of failures. Nevertheless, suitable measures related to the impact of system failures on the passengers can be devised.

The ability of a transit system to continue providing transportation services as scheduled or advertised may be termed as the "operational reliability". (In this definition, it is assumed that schedules are set within normal capabilities of the system.) If the transit system cannot provide scheduled service when every subsystem is working normally, it is a problem of planning, scheduling, or operations management. A failure in a subsystem, however, causes a perturbation which may affect the system's ability to provide adequate service. The impact of failures on the schedule keeping ability of a transit system is the concern of operational reliability. The demand based measures of reliability are, therefore, also the measures of operational reliability. Some measures are described here.

Delay – This is the basic measure of operational reliability [5]. So long as a passenger can get from one station to another in a comfortable, safe, and timely manner, a failure occurring in a system does not bother him. A minor delay may be hardly noticed but if the passengers suffer long delays, or if the delay is too frequent, the transit system will appear unreliable to the passengers. Failure induced delay is, therefore, a meaningful measure of operational reliability. The delay may be incurred at the following points:

Departure points – When a passenger arrives at a departure point, the system may be inoperative or operative in a degraded mode. This adds to the waiting time, making the total travel time longer.

Delay during travel – The passengers on board the vehicles may suffer delay due to the breakdown of a subsystem. The delay can be broadly classified into three categories:

1/ Minor delay $<$ x units of time
2/ Major delay $>$ x units of time
3/ Entrapment, a major delay requiring passenger evacuation.

There does not appear to be enough relevant data on passenger intolerance of delays and this appears to be a useful, though difficult, area for investigation. Despite extensive investigations, some judgement will always be involved in fixing the value of x. The basic

quantitative measures of operational reliability in terms of delay [5] are:

1/ $P_D(x_1,x_2)$, i.e., the probability that a passenger will encounter a delay, $> x_1$ and $<x_2$, on a trip. The length of the delay is defined by the interval (x_1,x_2). The interval $(0,x)$ means a delay less than x whereas (x,∞) means delay longer than x.

2/ MTBD, the mean time between two successive delays suffered by a passenger.

3/ Expected value of delay.

Using the frequency concept of probability, $P_D(x_1,x_2)$ can also be interpreted as the limiting value of the proportion of the trips having a delay (x_1,x_2) to the total number of trips. Suppose that a person makes a large number of trips of varying lengths. If the trips on which he incurred a delay of say greater than 5 min were counted and then divided by the total number of trips, it would approximate $P_D(5,\infty)$. The probability can be further converted into MTBD by knowing the number of trips in a year. It will also be desirable to compute the expected value of delay. Data, however, may not be available to compute these measures. The calculation of these measures could be simplified by relating the delay to the vehicles rather than the passengers. In such a case, the ratio of delayed vehicle trips to the total vehicle trips would be calculated.

Many measures of operational reliability can be defined [5,6,7,8]. These measures should reflect the delay incurred or travel time lost by the passengers or vehicles. The real difficulties, however, lie not in defining measures of operational reliability but in developing suitable analysis techniques and obtaining valid data for calculating these measures.

LOCE or LOCP

As noted earlier, it is not difficult to define more sophisticated measures of operational reliability. The harder part is the data and subsequent synthesis of this data to calculate the measure. Any measure may prove satisfactory so long as it reasonably reflects the ability of the system to provide adequate transportation service. One simpler measure may be called "Loss of Capacity Expectation" (LOCE) or "Loss of Capacity Probability" (LOCP). These can be defined as the probability that the system will not have enough capacity to meet the demand adequately. This can also be interpreted as the expected value of time during which the system cannot meet the demand. This will include the periods of complete system down as well as the periods of degraded operation, e.g., not enough vehicles being available or some other subsystem failure causing deficient operation. The LOCE is computed as:

$$\text{LOCE} = \sum_i P_i Q_i \qquad (2.8)$$

where

P_i = Probability of the system being in state i

and

Q_i = Probability that the system will not be able to meet demand in state i

The LOCE gives the same weight to all system deficiencies irrespective of the magnitude of the impact and it is, therefore, likely to be a conservative measure. This approach is identical to the use of LOLE (loss of load expectation) in power generation planning studies [9] by the electric power utilities.

3/Vehicle System Model

3.1/General

This section first describes the model for a single vehicle and then for the system of vehicles. The vehicle includes the body structure and all on-board equipment carried by the vehicle. A vehicle can have several modes of failure. For the sake of simplicity, however, each component of the vehicle is assumed to have two modes of failure:

1/*Retrieval or Total Failure Mode*
With this type of failure, the vehicle is immobilized on the track and it cannot move on its own. External assistance is normally required for clearing it from the track. This kind of failure is severe and causes serious delay to the passengers as not only the affected vehicle is stuck but the upstream vehicles also come to a halt.

2/*Partial Failure Mode*
This type of failure causes degradation of vehicle performance but the vehicle is not immobilized and can clear the track on its own. Such failures cause system slowdown but do not interrupt the service. When the defective vehicle clears the track by getting into a siding or into the maintenance yard, the normal flow of traffic is resumed.

3.2/Vehicle Model

The reliability model for a single, track-bound transit vehicle is shown in Figure 2, where the following notation is used:

λ_{i1}, λ_{i2} The retrieval and partial mode failure rates of the ith component, i.e.,

λ_{i1} = 1/(Mean time between retrieval mode failures of the ith component)

λ_{i2} = 1/(Mean time between partial mode failures of the ith component)

μ_r Retrieval rate = 1/Mean time to retrieve a vehicle.

Figure 2/Vehicle Model



μ_p Partial failure recovery rate = 1/Mean time to clear a partially failed vehicle.

μ_i Repair rate of the ith component = 1/Mean time to repair the ith component.

The normally operating state of the vehicle is denoted by 'O'. From this state, the vehicle can fail into a retrieval mode failure (denoted by RET) or a partial mode failure, denoted by PAR. The vehicle is either retrieved from the track or in the case of partial failure it clears the track on its own power and passes into the down state (denoted DN) in the maintenance area. The vehicle is then repaired, bringing it back into its normally operating state 'O'. It should be noted that the mean retrieval time is assumed to be the same for failures originating from different components. The same is true for the mean time to clear a partial mode failure.

The vehicle states can be grouped using the concept of equivalent transition rate defined in Equation 2.3. The equivalent model is shown in Figure 3 where:

Equivalent State (Figure 3)	Original States (Figure 2)	Description
O	O	Operating state
RET	(11,21,...,i1,...)	Retrieval mode failure
PAR	(12,22,...,i2,...)	Partial mode failure
DN	(13,23,...,i3,...)	Being repaired off track



Figure 3/Equivalent Vehicle Model

Strictly speaking, the merging of states (13,23,...,i3,...) is correct only if the component repair rates are equal (see conditions of mergeability [1]). The error introduced because of nonequality of repair rates is, however, relatively small. The equivalent transition rates of Figure 3 can be calculated using Equation 2.3. As an example, for calculating λ_1 (i.e., the equivalent transition rate from the state O to state RET),

$$X^- = (0)$$

and $X^+ = (11,21,...,i1,...)$

and therefore,

$$\lambda_1 = \sum_i P_o \lambda_{i1}/P_o$$

$$= \sum_i \lambda_{i1} \qquad (3.1)$$

Similarly, for μ (the equivalent transition rate from the state DN to the state O),

$$X^- = (13,23,...,i3,...)$$

and $X^+ = (0)$

Therefore:

$$\mu = \sum_i P_{i3}\, \mu_i / \sum_i P_{i3} \qquad (3.2)$$

Now:

$$P_{i3} \cdot \mu_i = P_{i1}\, \mu_r + P_{i2}\, \mu_p$$

$$= P_o \lambda_{i1} + P_o \lambda_{i2}$$

i.e.,

$$P_{i3} = (\lambda_{i1} + \lambda_{i2})\, P_o/\mu_i \qquad (3.3)$$

Substituting P_{i3} from Equation 3.3 into Equation 3.2:

$$\mu = \sum_i (\lambda_{i1} + \lambda_{i2}) / \sum_i (\lambda_{i1} + \lambda_{i2})\, T_i \qquad (3.4)$$

where:

$$T_i = 1/\mu_i$$

In a similar fashion it can be proved that the equivalent transition rates μ_r and μ_p in Figure 3 have the same values as μ_r and μ_p in Figure 2.

3.3/Vehicle System Model

The state space model of a single vehicle is described in Section 3.2. This section (3.3) describes the model for the system of vehicles, i.e., all the passenger-

carrying vehicles in the system. The model is based on the following assumptions:

1/ Only the operating vehicles are liable to fail and the vehicles on standby or maintenance are not subject to failure. This assumption results in assigning zero failure rates to the vehicles being maintained or in standby mode. The failure rate of a cold standby can be generally assumed zero. If the vehicles are in a warm standby mode, i.e., partially powered, this assumption is valid only so long as the failure rate in warm standby mode is small as compared with that of the operating vehicle.

2/ The failure of a single vehicle in the retrieval mode causes the whole system of vehicles to be down. The duration of the down time of a vehicle is considered to be the interval from the time it comes to a halt to the time of resuming normal operation. The down time of all the vehicles, i.e., the directly affected vehicle plus the vehicles coming to a halt as a result of blocking, is assumed to be the same. This assumption was made because of short headways and a relatively small loop length. In a larger loop and with longer headways, all the vehicles may not be equally affected and correction of the models may be needed.

3/ A vehicle in a partial failure mode is assumed to be removed from the system as soon as possible after the occurrence of the failure and therefore the probability of another unit failing during this period or of the partial mode passing into full mode is assumed to be zero.

4/ So long as there is even one standby, a unit on which maintenance is completed will be interchanged with an operating or standby unit. When no spares are left, however, the unit passes directly from maintenance into the operating mode, without going on standby.

A section of the state transition diagram of the model for the system of vehicles is shown in Figure 4 where n, s and m denote the number of operating, spare, and on maintenance (preventive) units, respectively. The bigger squares represent the operating states and the small squares denote the corresponding partial and retrieval mode states. The index in the top left corner of the operating state is the state number



Figure 4/A Section of Vehicle System State Transition Diagram

and the number of failed units is indicated in the lower left corner. The first column of states has m units on maintenance and is called group m in Figure 4, the second column is called group (m - 1) and has (m - 1) units on maintenance and so on. Only two groups are shown in Figure 4. In the state index i_x, i denotes the state number and x denotes the affiliation, namely:

o for operating state
r for retrieval state
and p for partially operating state

For example, 2_o indicates state 2 in the operating mode and 2_r and 2_p indicate the associated retrieval and partial modes. The relationships between the various states can be better understood by tracing through a few of the states. Starting at the top of Figure 4, 1_o represents the state when every unit is as it should be. In this state, there are n operating units, s spare units to replace the failed units, preventive maintenance is being carried on m units, and there is no failed unit. From state 1_o, the system could transit into state 1_r or 1_p by the failure of a unit in the retrieval and partial modes, respectively. In state 1_r, the failed vehicle sits on the track and brings the system to a halt. After the failed vehicle is removed, the system enters state 2_o, there is one failed unit and this failed unit has been replaced by a spare unit, reducing the number of spares by one. Similarly, from state 1_p the system will transit to state 2_o by the partial failure recovery. From state 2_o, the system could transit into state 1_o by the repair of the failed unit or it could transit into 2_r or 2_p by the failure of another unit. This pattern of transitions continues until state $(s + 1)_o$, with s failed units and o units on standby, is reached. In state $(s + 1)_o$, in addition to the pattern of transitions discussed earlier, another mode of transition is introduced, i.e., when maintenance on a unit is completed, it is put in the standby mode (group m - 1). Now consider state $(s + 2)_o$ in which (n - 1) units are operating, i.e., one less than the required number. If maintenance is now completed on a unit, it is put into the operating mode and the system transits into $(s + n + 3)_o$. The rest of the states can be traced in a similar manner.

3.4/Reduced Vehicle System Model

The number of system states (NVS) can be derived from Figure 4 as:

$$NVS = 3(s - 1) + (m + 1)(3n + 4) \qquad (3.5)$$

For example, for n = 50, s = 2, and m = 4; NVS = 773 states. The number of states can be considerably reduced by merging i_r and i_p with i_o. The reduced model is shown in Figure 5 and its state i is equivalent to (i_o, i_r, i_p) of Figure 4. The number of states is given by:

$$RNVS = (s - 1) + (m + 1)(n + 2) \qquad (3.6)$$

Now, for n = 50, s = 2, and m = 4; RNVS = 261 as compared with NVS = 773. For m units on maintenance, there are (m + 1) groups of states of Figure 5. The equivalent transition rates between various states of Figure 5 can be calculated using Equation 2.3.

1/ Equivalent transition rates within a particular group. The transition rate from state i to state i + 1 is

$$\lambda_{ii+1} = P_{ip} \cdot \mu_p + P_{ir} \cdot \mu_r / (P_{io} + P_{ip} + P_{ir}) \qquad (3.7)$$

Now

$$P_{ir} = O_i \lambda_1 / \mu_r \qquad (3.8)$$

and

$$P_{ip} = O_i \lambda_2 / \mu_p \qquad (3.9)$$

where

O_i = Number of operating units in state i.

Substituting for P_{ir} and P_{ip} from Equations 3.8 and 3.9 into Equation 3.7:

$$\lambda_{ii+1} = O_i (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/Z_i \qquad (3.10)$$

where

$$Z_i = 1 + O_i (\lambda_1/\mu_r + \lambda_2/\mu_p)$$

Similarly,

$$\lambda_{ii-1} = P_{io} \mu D_i / (P_{io} + P_{ir} + P_{ip}) = \mu D_i / Z_i \qquad (3.11)$$

where

D_i = Number of failed units in the state i.

2/ Equivalent transition rates from a particular group to the next group (say j to j + 1).

The equivalent transition rate from state i to i + n + 1 is given by:

$$\mu_{i\,i+n+1} = m_i \mu_m l_i P_{io}/(P_{io}+P_{ir}+P_{ip})$$

$$= m_i \mu_m l_i/Z_i \qquad (3.12)$$

where

m_i = Number of units on maintenance in state i

$\mu_m = 1/T_m$

T_m = Mean Maintenance Time

l_i = 0 for number of spares in state $i > 0$
= 1 otherwise.



Figure 5/A Section of Reduced State Transition Diagram of Vehicle System

3/ The equivalent transition rates from a particular group to the previous group are as shown in Figure 5.

3.5/Solution for State Probabilities and Reliability Measures

State Equations

The steady state equations for the equivalent model (Figure 5) can be written using Equation 2.2. In the matrix notation this can be written in the form:

$$AP = 0 \qquad (3.13)$$

where

A is an N x N matrix such that its ijth term represents the transition rate from state j to state i, N being the total number of states.

P is a column vector whose ith term is P_i, i.e., the probability of being in state i.

and

0 is a column vector having all elements as zero.

The N equations of Equation 3.13 are linearly dependent, i.e., any equation can be obtained from the remaining (N - 1) equations. Therefore, any (N - 1) equations of Equation 3.13 together with the total probability equation (3.14) can be solved to obtain P.

$$\sum_i P_i = 1.0 \qquad (3.14)$$

In the matrix form any row of A and the corresponding element in 0 are changed to 1.0 before solution. The linear equations can be solved using numerical methods such as Gauss elimination. Once the probabilities of the equivalent states have been determined, the probabilities of the original states can be calculated using the following equations:

$$P_{io} = P_i/Z_i \qquad (3.15)$$

$$P_{ir} = O_i \lambda_i P_{io}/\mu_r \qquad (3.16)$$

and

$$P_{ip} = O_i \lambda_2 P_{io}/\mu_p \qquad (3.17)$$

Vehicle Exposure Factor

The vehicle system model described in Section 3.3 is good for the on-line stations. When, however, the

stations are off-line, the retrieval mode failure of a vehicle within the station limits does not immobilize the rest of the vehicles since they can bypass on the express lane. The retrieval state i_r can, therefore, be decomposed into i_{r1} and i_{r2}, representing failure within the station limit and on-line, respectively. The probabilities for these states can be computed as follows:

$$P_{i_{r1}} = P_{ir} \cdot E \tag{3.18}$$

and

$$P_{i_{r2}} = P_{ir} \cdot (1 - E) \tag{3.19}$$

where E is the exposure factor, defined as the limiting ratio of the unit failures within the station limits to the total failures and is assumed approximately equal to the ratio of the length of the guideway within station limits to the total length of the guideway.

The vehicle failures within the station limits will, however, shut down the station lane and are therefore considered a part of the station lane failures. The equivalent failure rate component to be added to the station lane failure rate is calculated by:

$$\lambda_{VS} = \Sigma P_{io} \cdot O_i \cdot \lambda_1 / \sum_i P_{io} \cdot N_{ST} \tag{3.20}$$

where

N_{ST} = Number of passenger stations

Vehicle System Reliability Measures

Once the state probabilities have been calculated, the event (subset of states) probabilities, frequencies, and other measures can be calculated using Equations 2.4 to 2.7. There are many ways of defining the events and two of them are described below.

1/*Exact State Measures*

These measures consist in calculating the probabilities and frequencies of encountering states having the operating vehicles equal to a particular value and can be designated as $P(N_o = n)$ and $f(N_o = n)$, where N_o denotes the operating vehicles. The probability of $N_o = n$ can be simply calculated by adding the probabilities of all states having 'n' operating vehicles. The frequency and other measures can be calculated using Equations 2.5 to 2.7.

2/*Cumulative State Measures*

Another way of representing the measures would be as the probabilities and frequencies of encountering states having the operating vehicles less than a particular value. The equations for these measures are given below:

$$P(N_o \leq n) = \sum_{i:O_i \leq n} (P_{io} + P_{ir1} + P_{ip}) + \sum_i P_{ir2} \tag{3.21}$$

and

$$f(N_o \leq n) = P_{ko} \cdot O_k \lambda_1 E + P_{kp} \mu_p + \sum_i P_{io} O_i \lambda_1 (1 - E) \tag{3.22}$$

where state k_o is such that for $(k_o + 1)$, $N_o = n$.

3.6/Vehicle System Example

The models described in this report have been implemented in a computer program [10]. Starting with the component data, the program generates the transition rate matrices for the subsystem and system models and then solves these matrix equations to provide system based reliability measures.

The vehicle system data for this example is printed out in Table 1A. The system consists of 14 vehicles out of which 2 are on maintenance and 2 are kept as spares. The assumed failure rate and other data are also listed in Table 1A.

The probabilities of being in various states (see Figure 4) are printed in Table 1B. The state description on the right hand side pertains to i_o, the operating state. Column P contains probabilities of the operating states i_o and the associated columns PR, PS, and PP give the probabilities of i_{r2}, i_{r1}, and i_p. It can be seen that the most significant probability values are for states (10,2,2), (10,1,2) and the operating states of (10,1,1), and (10,1,0).

The state probabilities are grouped as a function of the exact number of vehicles in Table 1C. The second column, "PROB OF OPTG", gives the probability of being in the operating state with the number

Table 1A/ Vehicle System Data

Mean Time to Vehicle Failure (Permanent)	5000.0000 h
Mean Time to Vehicle Failure (Partial Mode)	500.0000 h
Mean Time to Vehicle Retrieval	0.5000 h
Mean Time to Clear Partial Mode Vehicle	0.2500 h
Mean Time to Vehicle Maintenance	3.0000 h
Mean Time to Vehicle Repair	2.5000 h
Number of Operating Vehicles	10
Number of Spare Vehicles	2
Number of Vehicles on Maintenance	2
Vehicle Exposure Factor	0.3000

of vehicles indicated in the first column. The third column, "FREQ OF OPTG", can be interpreted in either of two ways: 1, the number of times the system transits out of the state in a day, or 2, the number of times per day the state is entered by the system. The fourth and fifth columns indicate the probabilities and frequencies of encountering the partial operating states. The probability and frequency of the system being in the retrieval state are given at the bottom.

The reliability measures arranged in the cumulative form are indicated in Table 1D, where the reliability measures for $N_o \leq 9$ and downwards all are approximately equal. This is due to the presence of 2 spares and 2 units on maintenance which also can behave as spares. The probabilities of states with operating units less than 10 are relatively low and therefore are dominated by the retrieval state probability.

The results for another example, which is the same as the previous one except that there are no units spare or on maintenance, are given in Tables 2A-D. In 2D, the reliability measures tend to be almost equal from $N_o \leq 7$downwards as compared with $N_o \leq 9$ in Table 1D. The probability and frequency of encountering states with a specified number of failures depends upon the failure rate of units, number of spares, and number of units on maintenance. These relationships will become clearer in the sections on sensitivity studies (Sections 8.1 and 8.2).

Table 1B/ The Probabilities of Being in Various States

State No.	PR	PS	P	PP	State Description O	S	M
1	0.658554E-03	0.282237E-03	0.940792D 00	0.470396E-02	10	2	2
2	0.357769E-04	0.153330E-04	0.511099D-01	0.255549E-03	10	1	2
3	0.533779E-06	0.228762E-06	0.762541D-03	0.381271E-05	10	0	2
4	0.564417E-08	0.241893E-08	0.895901D-05	0.403156E-07	9	0	2
5	0.437401E-10	0.187458E-10	0.781074D-07	0.312429E-09	8	0	2
6	0.252282E-12	0.108121E-12	0.514861D-09	0.180201E-11	7	0	2
7	0.108501E-14	0.465003E-15	0.258335D-11	0.775005E-14	6	0	2
8	0.344093E-17	0.147468E-17	0.983122D-14	0.245780E-16	5	0	2
9	0.782828E-20	0.335498E-20	0.279582D-16	0.559163E-19	4	0	2
10	0.121067E-22	0.518858E-23	0.576509D-19	0.864764E-22	3	0	2
11	0.114135E-25	0.489148E-26	0.815247D-22	0.815247E-25	2	0	2
12	0.495558E-29	0.212382E-29	0.707940D-25	0.353970E-28	1	0	2
13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	2
14	0.265234E-06	0.113672E-06	0.378906D-03	0.189453E-05	10	1	1
15	0.152215E-06	0.652349E-07	0.217450D-03	0.108725E-05	10	0	1
16	0.351460E-08	0.150626E-08	0.557873D-05	0.251043E-07	9	0	1
17	0.390439E-10	0.167331E-10	0.697212D-07	0.278885E-09	8	0	1
18	0.281618E-12	0.120694E-12	0.574731D-09	0.201156E-11	7	0	1
19	0.141748E-14	0.807490E-15	0.337495D-11	0.101248E-13	6	0	1
20	0.506249E-17	0.216964E-17	0.144642D-13	0.361606E-16	5	0	1
21	0.126534E-19	0.542289E-20	0.451908D-16	0.903815E-19	4	0	1
22	0.211348E-22	0.905779E-23	0.100642D-18	0.150963E-21	3	0	1
23	0.212540E-25	0.910887E-26	0.151815D-21	0.151814E-24	2	0	1
24	0.975243E-29	0.417961E-29	0.139321D-24	0.696602E-28	1	0	1
25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	1
26	0.525947E-06	0.225406E-06	0.751354D-03	0.375677E-05	10	1	0
27	0.629002E-08	0.269572E-08	0.888575D-05	0.449287E-07	10	0	0
28	0.327710E-09	0.140447E-09	0.520174D-06	0.234078E-08	9	0	0
29	0.787093E-11	0.337325E-11	0.140552D-07	0.562209E-10	8	0	0
30	0.770138E-13	0.330059E-13	0.157171D-09	0.550099E-12	7	0	0
31	0.465970E-15	0.199702E-15	0.110945D-11	0.332836E-14	6	0	0
32	0.189401E-17	0.811720E-18	0.541147D-14	0.135287E-16	5	0	0
33	0.522363E-20	0.223870E-20	0.186558D-16	0.373117E-19	4	0	0
34	0.943872E-23	0.404516E-23	0.449463D-19	0.674194E-22	3	0	0
35	0.996333E-26	0.427000E-26	0.711667D-22	0.711666E-25	2	0	0
36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0
37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0

Table 1C/The Exact State Probabilities and Frequencies

Number of Vehicles	Probability of Operating	Frequency of Operating	Probable Partial Mode	Frequency of Partial Mode
10	0.994319E 00	0.510543E 00	0.497009E-02	0.477130E 00
9	0.153546E-04	0.692341E-03	0.677606E-07	0.650502E-05
8	0.165949E-06	0.903139E-05	0.647535E-09	0.621633E-07
7	0.128561E-08	0.816761E-07	0.436367E-11	0.418912E-09
6	0.732957E-11	0.531376E-09	0.212033E-13	0 203551E-11
5	0.309791E-13	0.251992E-11	0.742673E-16	0.712966E-14
4	0.962607E-16	0.867087E-14	0.183609E-18	0.176265E-16
3	0.214256E-18	0.211488E-16	0.304859E-21	0.292665E-19
2	0.322797E-21	0.346075E-19	0.304506E-24	0.292325E 22
1	0.228385E-24	0.257839E-22	0.105057E-27	0.100855E-25
0	0.630343E-29	0.0	0.0	0.0

Ret. State Probability = 0.695823E-03
Ret. State Frequency Day = 0.333995–01

Table 1D/ Cumulative State Probabilities and Frequencies

Operating Vehicles Equal to or Less Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration Days
10	0.100000E 01	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	0.711412E-03	0.338880E-01	0.295089E 02	0.209930E-01
8	0.695990E-03	0.334062E-01	0.299345E 02	0.208341E-01
7	0.695824E-03	0.333996E-01	0.299405E 02	0.208333E-01
6	0.695825E-03	0.333995E-01	0.299405E 02	0.208333E-01
5	0.695823E-03	0.333995E-01	0.299405E 02	0.208333E-01

Table 2A/ Vehicle System Data

Mean Time to Vehicle Failure (Permanent)	5000.0000 h
Mean Time to Vehicle Failure (Partial Mode)	500.0000 h
Mean Time to Vehicle Retrieval	0.5000 h
Mean Time to Clear Partial Mode Vehicle	0.2500 h
Mean Time to Vehicle Maintenance	3.0000 h
Mean Time to Vehicle Repair	2.5000 h
Number of Operating Vehicles	10
Number of Spare Vehicles	0
Number of Vehicles on Maintenance	0
Vehicle Exposure Factor	0.3000

Table 2B/ The Probabilities of Being in Various States

State No.	PR	PS	P	PP	State Description 0	S	M
1	0.658709E-03	0.282304E-03	0.941013D 00	0.470506E-02	10	0	0
2	0.326061E-04	0.139740E-04	0.517557D-01	0.232901E-03	9	0	0
3	0.717334F-06	0.307429E-06	0.128095D-02	0.512381E-05	8	0	0
4	0.920579E-08	0.394534E-08	0.187873D-04	0.6575565-07	7	0	0
5	0.759478E-10	0.325490E-10	0.180828D-06	0.542484E-09	6	0	0
6	0.417713E-12	0.179020E-12	0.119346D-08	0.298366E-11	5	0	0
7	0.153161E-14	0.656405E-15	0.547004D-11	0.109401E-13	4	0	0
8	0.361005E-17	0.154716E-17	0.171907D-13	0.257861E-16	3	0	0
9	0.486145E-20	0.208348E-20	0.347247D-16	0.347246E-19	2	0	0
10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0
11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0

Table 2C/ The Exact State Probabilities and Frequencies

Number of Vehicles	Probability of Operating	Frequency of Operating	Probable Partial Mode	Frequency of Partial Mode
10	0.941013E 00	0.496855E 00	0.470506E-02	0.451686E 00
9	0.520380E-01	0.521449E 00	0.232901E-03	0.223585E-01
8	0.129493E-02	0.251354E-01	0.512381E-05	0.491886E-03
7	0.190947E-04	0.548019E-03	0.657556E-07	0.631254E-05
6	0.184773E-06	0.700109E-05	0.542484E-09	0.520785E-07
5	0.122601E-08	0.576014E-07	0.298366E-11	0.286431E-09
4	0.564906E-11	0.316230E-09	0.109401E-13	0.105025E-11
3	0.178471E-13	0.115794E-11	0.257861E-16	0.247546E-14
2	0.362718E-16	0.267052E-14	0.347246E-19	0.333357E-17
1	0.208348E-20	0.0	0.0	0.0
0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Ret. State Probability = 0.692041E-03
Ret. State Frequency (Per Day) = 0.332180E-01

Table 2D/ Cumulative State Probabilities and Frequencies

Operating Vehicles Equal to or Less Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration Days
10	0.100000E 01	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	0.542823E-01	0.496855E 00	0.201266E 01	0.109252E 00
8	0.201144E-02	0.562123E-01	0.177897E 02	0.357829E-01
7	0.711388E-03	0.337242E-01	0.296523E 02	0.210943E-01
6	0.692228E-03	0.332245E-01	0.300983E 02	0.208349E-01
5	0.692042E-03	0.332180E-01	0.301041E 02	0.208333E-01
4	0.692041E-03	0.332180E-01	0.301042E 02	0.208333E-01
3	0.692041E-03	0.332180E-01	0.301042E 02	0.208333E-01

4/System Model For Trains

When the trains are regarded strictly as single units for operation, spares, and maintenance, the vehicle system model described in Section 3 can be used. The model described here is, however, based on a more flexible policy for train formation. The general procedure is the same as for the vehicle system, namely:

1/ Generate the possibility space by enumerating and describing the possible system states.
2/ Develop the transition rate matrix.
3/ Solve for probabilities and calculate reliability measures.

The state space is generated by a subroutine in the computer program [10] according to the following rules for the train formation:

1/ When a vehicle in the train fails, the train is removed from service and a spare train, if available, is put into operation as a replacement. If, however, a complete spare train is not available, the defective vehicle is replaced by a good vehicle and the train is put back into operation. If no good vehicle is available, the defective vehicle is removed and the train put back into operation. There is no additional difficulty in modelling with married pairs as they can be treated as single units.
2/ Train consists of different lengths are allowed.
3/ In case of no available spares and when all trains are not full length, a vehicle on which maintenance or repair is completed is attached to the train having the least number of vehicles.

In the rules outlined above, it is attempted to keep the maximum vehicle system capacity in the operating condition. The rules 1-3 represent only one policy and models can be similarly developed for other policies. The results of the solution of the train model are grouped in terms of vehicle system capacity, i.e., the output format is the same as for the vehicle system model.

5/Passenger Station Model

The stations are assumed to be off-line and basically of two types:

1/ Stations having one station lane and an express lane for through traffic. These are called type A stations in this report.
2/ Stations having two station lanes and an expressway lane, called type B stations.

5.1/Model for a Single Station

The state transition diagrams for type A and type B stations are shown in Figures 6 and 7, respectively, using the following notation:

For type A station (Figure 6),

U — Stands for normal station operation, i.e., both the station lane and the express lane are working.

D — Means that station lane is down.

L — Denotes the failure of the station lane as well as the express lane, i.e., complete failure of type A station.

$\bar{L}$ — Station lane is working but the express lane is down.

For type B station (Figure 7),

2D — Both the station lanes are down.

$\bar{L}_1$ — One station lane working and the express lane down.

$\bar{L}_2$ — Both station lanes working with express lanes down.

λ_s, μ_s — The failure and repair rates of the station lane including the contribution λ_{VS} of the vehicle system failure.

λ_e, μ_e — Express lane failure and repair rates.



Figure 6/State Transition Diagram of Type A Station

The impact of the various station states on the system can be tabulated in the following form.

Type A Station

Station State	Impact on System	Impact on Station
U	Traffic can pass	Passengers can embark/disembark
D	Traffic can pass	Passengers cannot embark/disembark
L	Traffic cannot pass	Passengers cannot embark/disembark
$\bar{L}$	Traffic can pass	Passengers can embark/disembark

Type B Station

U	Traffic can pass	Passengers can embark/disembark
D	Traffic can pass	Passengers can embark/disembark
2D	Traffic can pass	Passengers cannot embark/disembark
L	Traffic cannot pass	Passengers cannot embark/disembark
$\bar{L}_1$	Traffic can pass	Passengers can embark/disembark
$\bar{L}_2$	Traffic can pass	Passengers can embark/disembark



Figure 7/State Transition Diagram of Type B Station

5.2/Model for System of Stations

A transit system may have "NO" number of type A stations and "N1" number of type B stations. The model for the system can be built by combining the models for the individual stations. It is assumed that when both the station lanes and the express lanes are down at a station and no traffic can pass through, no further failure of stations takes place.

The model for the system of stations is built by sequential addition [1]. This is achieved by adding one station at a time, solving for state probabilities, deleting low probability states, and adding the next station. This procedure helps to keep the system states within manageable limits. The process of sequential addition is illustrated in Table 3 for three type A stations with the following hypothetical data:

Mean up time of the station lane = 800 h
Mean down time of the station lane = 2 h
Mean up time of the express lane = 1000 h
Mean down time of the express lane = 2 h

The model for a single station is represented in Table 3(a). The addition of one more station is shown in Table 3(b). For each state of the station being added, there is a set of system states of Table 3 (a) except the state (3,3). The state (3,3), representing two stations completely down (state L), is assumed not possible since exposure to failure is assumed zero as soon as one station is completely down. The system states in Table 3 (b) are numbered in the serial order and the numbers in parenthesis indicate the combination, the first number denoting the system state before addition and the second indicating the state of the station being added. The identical states can now be grouped together as shown in Table 3(c). The states with probabilities less than 10^{-5} (an arbitrary reference) are now deleted and the remaining states are shown in Table 3(d), where the state numbers are serial and have no relationship to state numbers in Table 3(c). Tables 3(e) and 3(f) show the addition of the third station. If a fourth station is now to be added, then the states with probabilities less than 10^{-5} can again be deleted and the procedure repeated. The exact results (i.e., without any truncation) are shown in Table 4 and are almost identical to Table 3(f). In general, the effect of this procedure on the results depends on the reference probability value employed for truncation.

Table 3/Sequential Model Building

System State	Identical States	No. of Stations in State U	D	L	$\bar{L}$	Probability
(a) Model of a single station						
1		1	0	0	0	
2		0	1	0	0	
3		0	0	1	0	
4		0	0	0	1	
(b) Addition of a station						
1 (1,1)		2	0	0	0	
2 (2,1)		1	1	0	0	
3 (3,1)		1	0	1	0	
4 (4,1)		1	0	0	1	
5 (1,2)		1	1	0	0	
6 (2,2)		0	2	0	0	
7 (3,2)		0	1	1	0	
8 (4,2)		0	1	0	1	
9 (1,3)		1	0	1	0	
10 (2,3)		0	1	1	0	
11 (4,3)		0	0	1	1	
12 (1,4)		1	0	0	1	
13 (2,4)		0	1	0	1	
14 (3,4)		0	0	1	1	
15 (4,4)		0	0	0	2	
(c) Merging of identical states						
1	1	2	0	0	0	0.991051
2	2,5	1	1	0	0	0.495525×10^{-2}
3	3,9	1	0	1	0	0.992536×10^{-5}
4	4,12	1	0	0	1	0.396420×10^{-2}
5	6	0	2	0	0	0.618994×10^{-5}
6	7,10	0	1	1	0	0.165058×10^{-7}
7	8,13	0	1	0	1	0.990308×10^{-5}
8	11,14	0	0	1	1	0.132036×10^{-7}
9	15	0	0	0	2	0.396090×10^{-5}
(d) Truncation of states with probabilities less than 10^{-5}						
1		2	0	0	0	0.991051
2		1	1	0	0	0.495525×10^{-2}
3		1	0	1	0	0.992536×10^{-5}
4		1	0	0	1	0.396420×10^{-2}
5		0	2	0	0	0.618994×10^{-5}
6		0	1	0	1	0.990308×10^{-5}
7		0	0	0	2	0.396090×10^{-5}

Table 3/(continued)

System State	Identical States	No. of Stations in State U	D	L	$\bar{L}$	Probability
(e) Addition of the third station						
1 (1,1)		3	0	0	0	
2 (2,1)		2	1	0	0	
3 (3,1)		2	0	1	0	
4 (4,1)		2	0	0	1	
5 (5,1)		1	2	0	0	
6 (6,1)		1	1	0	1	
7 (7,1)		1	0	0	2	
8 (1,2)		2	1	0	0	
9 (2,2)		1	2	0	0	
10 (3,2)		1	1	1	0	
11 (4,2)		1	1	0	1	
12 (5,2)		0	3	0	0	
13 (6,2)		0	2	0	1	
14 (7,2)		0	1	0	2	
15 (1,3)		2	0	1	0	
16 (2,3)		1	1	1	0	
17 (4,3)		1	0	1	1	(3,3) not possible
18 (5,3)		0	2	1	0	
19 (6,3)		0	1	1	1	
20 (7,3)		0	0	1	2	
21 (1,4)		2	0	0	1	
22 (2,4)		1	1	0	1	
23 (3,4)		1	0	1	1	
24 (4,4)		1	0	0	2	
25 (5,4)		0	2	0	1	
26 (6,4)		0	1	0	2	
27 (7,4)		0	0	0	3	
(f) Merging of identical states						
1	1	3	0	0	0	0.986606
2	2,8	2	1	0	0	0.739954×10^{-2}
3	3,15	2	0	1	0	0.148435×10^{-4}
4	4,21	2	0	0	1	0.591964×10^{-2}
5	5,9	1	2	0	0	0.184865×10^{-4}
6	6,11,22	1	1	0	1	0.295760×10^{-4}
7	7,24	1	0	0	2	0.118294×10^{-4}
8	10,16	1	1	1	0	0.493508×10^{-7}
9	12	0	3	0	0	0.153901×10^{-7}
10	13,25	0	2	0	1	0.369310×10^{-7}
11	14,26	0	1	0	2	0.295407×10^{-7}
12	17,23	1	0	1	1	0.394773×10^{-7}
13	18	0	2	1	0	0.461670×10^{-10}
14	19	0	1	1	1	0.738569×10^{-10}
15	20	0	0	1	2	0.295387×10^{-10}
16	27	0	0	0	3	0.787643×10^{-8}

Table 4/Model of Three Stations Without Truncation

System State	State No. as in Table 3 (f)	No. of Stations in State U	D	L	$\bar{L}$	Probability
1	1	3	0	0	0	0.986606
2	2	2	1	0	0	0.739954×10^{-2}
3	3	2	0	1	0	0.148435×10^{-4}
4	4	2	0	0	1	0.591964×10^{-2}
5	5	1	2	0	0	0.184865×10^{-4}
6	8	1	1	1	0	0.493508×10^{-7}
7	6	1	1	0	1	0.295760×10^{-4}
8	12	1	0	1	1	0.394773×10^{-7}
9	7	1	0	0	2	0.118294×10^{-4}
10	9	0	3	0	0	0.153901×10^{-7}
11	13	0	2	1	0	0.461824×10^{-10}
12	10	0	2	0	1	0.369310×10^{-7}
13	14	0	1	1	1	0.738538×10^{-10}
14	11	0	1	0	2	0.295407×10^{-7}
15	Deleted	0	1	2	0	0.123121×10^{-12}
16	Deleted	0	0	2	1	0.984465×10^{-13}
17	15	0	0	1	2	0.295264×10^{-10}
18	16	0	0	0	3	0.787643×10^{-8}

6/Models For Other Subsystems

6.1/Power Substations Model

A single power station is assumed to have only two states, "up" (the substation is working) and "down" (the substation is failed). The system of substations is, however, assumed as an m/n configuration, i.e., the system is good if m out of n substations are working. In other words, it is assumed that so long as m out of n substations are working, the power supply is adequate to keep the system running. When, however, one more substation fails, the system either completely fails or goes into severe degradation. The state transition diagram for the substations model is shown in Figure 8, where λ_{ss} and μ_{ss} are the substation failure and repair rates, respectively.

6.2/Guideway Model

Guideway consists of the structure, the power rails, and any other equipment whose failure would incapacitate the guideway. As an example, in magnetic levitation and linear induction propulsion, the guideway would include suspension armature rail and LIM rail. The guideway is assumed to be a two state system: up state when the guideway is in satisfactory condition and down state when a failure of guideway interrupts the flow of traffic.

6.3/Command and Control System Model

Command and control includes all equipment associated with the control of vehicle movement, except the vehicle-borne equipment which is regarded as a part of the vehicle. Like the guideway, the command and control is also assumed a two state system.

Figure 8/State Transition Diagram for Power Substations Model



7/Total System Model

The models for various subsystems have been described in Section 3.6. These models can be combined to give the reliability measures of the entire transit system.

7.1/System Based Reliability Measures

The various subsystem models can be combined by the sequential model building described in Section 5.2. The subsystem models, for this purpose, are reduced to the following equivalent forms:

1/*Vehicle/Train System Model*

The vehicle or train system model is represented by a two state equivalent such that:

State 1 = $(N_o > n)$ and State 2 = $(N_o \leq n)$

The equivalent transition rates are:

$$\lambda_{12} = f(N_o \leq n)/P(N_o > n)$$

and

$$\lambda_{21} = f(N_o \leq n)/P(N_o \leq n)$$

2/*Station System Model*

The station system model is reduced to a multi-state model whose states represent the possible combination of stations in the working state. For example, for a system of 3 type A and 1 type B stations, there could be (3,1), (2,1), (0,0) states, where the numbers in the parenthesis indicate the number of type A and type B stations in the up state. The equivalent transition rates between the various states can be determined using Equation 2.3.

3/*Substation Model*

State 1 = (number of up stations $\geq$ m)

and

State 2 = (number of up stations $<$ m)

The equivalent transition rates are:

$$\lambda_{12} = P(N_{ss} = m) \cdot m\lambda_{ss}/P(N_{ss} \geq m)$$

$$\lambda_{21} = P(N_{ss} = m - 1)(n - m + 1)\mu_{ss}/P(N_{ss} < m)$$

where

N_{ss} is the number of working substations.

The station system model, the substation system model, the command and control model, and the guideway model are combined together and the resulting states are grouped as $(N_A = i, N_B = j)$ where N_A and N_B indicate the number of type A and type B stations up, respectively. The state $N_A = 0$, $N_B = 0$ includes the condition of having the sub-

Table 5A/ Passenger Station Data

Number of Type A Stations	3	
Number of Type B Stations	1	
Mean Time to Failure of the Station		3260.88 h
Mean Time to Repair of the Station		1.97 h
Mean Time to Failure of the Expressway		466666.94 h
Mean Time to Repair of the Expressway		10.00 h

Table 5B/ Substation Data

Number of Substations	4	
Minimum Number of Substations Required for Operation	2	
Mean Time to Substation Failure		20000.00 h
Mean Time to Substation Repair		0.50 h
Substation System Availability	0.100000D 01	
Frequency of Encountering the Down State	0.899909D-11	per day
Cycle Time to Encounter Down State	0.111122D 12	days
Mean Duration of Down State	0.693342D 02	days

Table 5D/ Guideway Data

Mean Time to Guideway Failure		50000.00 h
Mean Time to Guideway Repair		10.00 h
Guideway Availablility	0.999800E 00	
Frequency of Encountering Down State	0.479904E-03	per day
Cycle Time to Encounter Down State	0.208375E 04	days
Mean Duration of Down State	0.416447E 00	days

Table 5C/ Command and Control System Data

Mean Time to Command and Control Failure		1666.67 h
Mean Time to Command and Control Repair		2.58 h
Command and Control Availability	0.998452E 00	
Frequency of Encountering Down State	0.143777E-01	per day
Cycle Time to Encounter Down State	0.695521E 02	days
Mean Duration of Down State	0.107639E 00	days

station system, guideway, or command and control down. Therefore, ($N_A = 0$, $N_B = 0$) does not necessarily mean that all the stations are failed. It really means that the stations are not available for embarkation because the system is not moving. This combined model is then combined with the vehicle system model to give the measures for the entire system.

The printout of the reliability measures of the system is shown in Tables 5E-5H. The data for the vehicle system is shown in Table 1A and for other subsystems in Tables 5A-5D.

7.2/Reliability Measures Including Demand

The calculation of probabilities, frequencies, and the mean duration of the various deficient states of the system is illustrated in Section 7.1. These system deficiencies can be further related to the delays they cause to the vehicles or to passengers and then the probabilities of these delays can be calculated. The extent to which such an analysis can be carried out depends upon the information available on the flow of passengers. The calculation of delays can be illustrated by an example.

Consider a system such that only the vehicle fleet need be considered and the other subsystems can be ignored. Delay could be caused by the following types of system deficiencies:

1/ A vehicle could fail in the retrieval mode blocking the flow of vehicles. This condition will last till the failed vehicle has been removed and the system put back into normal operation. Let the probability of being in this state be denoted by P_{RET}.

2/ A vehicle could fail in a partial mode, degrading the operation of the system till the vehicle finally clears the system. Let the probability of being in this state be denoted by P_{PR}.

3/ The number of vehicles available for service may be less than the required number, thereby causing a delay. This condition can result when spare vehicles are not available to replace the failed ones.

The probabilities of these deficiencies can be calculated using the models and methods described in this report. The probabilities can then be weighted with the probabilities of delay caused by these conditions. This will yield the probability of delay caused by system deficiencies. The calculation of probabilities of delay by deficient conditions is not covered in this report.

Table 5E/ System Reliability Measures

No. of Type A Stations Up	No. of Type B Stations Up	No. of Vehicles Greater Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration
3	1	9	0.995736D 00	0.705772E-01	0.141689E 02	14.108
2	1	9	0.180587D-02	0.220836E-01	0.452825E 02	0.082
1	1	9	0.109075D-05	0.265916E-04	0.376058E 05	0.041
0	0	9	0.174613D-02	0.149115E-01	0.670624E 02	0.117
No. of Type A Stations Up	**No. of Type B Stations Up**	**No. of Vehicles Equal to or Less Than**	**Probability**	**Frequency Per Day**	**Cycle Days**	**Mean Duration**
3	1	9	0.708883D-03	0.337937E-01	0.295913E 02	0.021
2	1	9	0.128563D-05	0.769191E-04	0.130007E 05	0.017
1	1	9	0.776522D-09	0.558943E-07	0.178909E 08	0.014
0	0	9	0.124310D-05	0.697885E-04	0.143290E 05	0.018
Failed Stations Greater Than		**No. of Vehicle Equal to or Less Than**	**Probability**	**Cycle Time Days**		
1		9	0.711412E-03	0.295606E 02		

Table 5F/ System Reliability Measures

No. of Type A Stations Up	No. of Type B Stations Up	No. of Vehicles Greater Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration
3	1	8	0.995751D 00	0.700977E-01	0.142658E 02	14.205
2	1	8	0.180590D-02	0.220830E-01	0.452836E 02	0.082
1	1	8	0.109076D-05	0.265915E-04	0.376060E 05	0.041
0	0	8	0.174615D-02	0.149109E-01	0.670651E 02	0.117

No. of Type A Stations Up	No. of Type B Stations Up	No. of Vehicles Equal to or Less Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration
3	1	8	0.693516D-03	0.333131E-01	0.300182E 02	0.021
2	1	8	0.125776D-05	0.757085E-04	0.132086E 05	0.017
1	1	8	0.759689D-09	0.549586E-07	0.181995E 08	0.014
0	0	8	0.121615D-05	0.687174E-04	0.145524E 05	0.018

Failed Stations Greater Than	No. of Vehicles Equal to or Less Than	Probability	Cycle Time Days
1	8	0.695990E-03	0.299870E 02

Table 5G/ System Reliability Measures

No. of Type A Stations Up	No. of Type B Stations Up	No. of Vehicles Greater Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration
3	1	7	0.995751D 00	0.700911E-01	0.142671E 02	14.207
2	1	7	0.180590D-02	0.220830E-01	0.452836E 02	0.082
1	1	7	0.109076D-05	0.265915E-04	0.376060E 05	0.041
0	0	7	0.174615D-02	0.149109E-01	0.670652E 02	0.117

No. of Type A Stations Up	No. of Type B Stations Up	No. of Vehicles Equal to or Less Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration
3	1	7	0.693350D-03	0.333065E-01	0.300242E 02	0.021
2	1	7	0.125746D-05	0.756928E-04	0.132113E 05	0.017
1	1	7	0.759507D-09	0.549469E-07	0.181994E 08	0.014
0	0	7	0.121586D-05	0.687033E-04	0.145553E 05	0.018

Failed Stations Greater Than	No. of Vehicles Equal to or Less Than	Probability	Cycle Time Days
1	7	0.695824E-03	0.299929E 02

Table 5H/ System Reliability Measures

No. of Type A Stations Up	No. of Type B Stations Up	No. of Vehicles Greater Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration
3	1	6	0.995751D 00	0.700911E-01	0.142672E 02	14.207
2	1	6	0.180590D-02	0.220830E-01	0.452836E 02	0.082
1	1	6	0.109076D-05	0.265915E-04	0.376060E 05	0.041
0	0	6	0.174615D-02	0.149109E-01	0.670652E 02	0.117

No. of Type A Stations Up	No. of Type B Stations Up	No. of Vehicles Equal to or Less Than	Probability	Frequency Per Day	Cycle Time Days	Mean Duration
3	1	6	0.693349D-03	0.333064E-01	0.300242E 02	0.021
2	1	6	0.125746D-05	0.756927E-04	0.132113E 05	0.017
1	1	6	0.759506D-09	0.549468E-07	0.181994E 08	0.014
0	0	6	0.121586D-05	0.687032E-04	0.145554E 05	0.018

Failed Stations Greater Than	No. of Vehicles Equal to or less Than	Probability	Cycle Time Days
1	6	0.695823E-03	0.299930E 02

8/System Studies

Some vehicle system sensitivity studies using these models are reported here. The system is assumed to consist of 50 operating vehicles and the relevant data is listed on the appropriate figures. The vehicle system state having a number of vehicles less than, or equal to 49 is considered as the reference state.

8.1/Sensitivity of Reliability Indices to the Vehicle MTBF (Retrieval Mode)

The effect of variation in vehicle mean time between failures (MTBF) on the probability, mean time to encounter and on the mean duration of the system state with vehicles $\leqslant 49$ is shown in Figures 9-11. The reliability indices are plotted for three cases, (s = 2, m = 2), (s = 0, m = 2) and (s = 0, m = 0). The probability of $N_O \leqslant 49$ is the lowest and the most sensitive in the case of s = 2, m = 2. This is because when there are no spare vehicles, the vehicle failure rate in partial mode begins to be effective, and since it is 500 h as compared with 5000 h for the retrieval mode, the partial failure mode dominates for s = 0. The mean time to encounter $N_O \leqslant 49$ is again highest for s = 2, m = 2 and shows the most sensitivity to variation in retrieval mode vehicle MTBF. This is because for s = 0 the partial mode of

Figure 9/System Failure Probability vs Vehicle MTBF





Figure 10/System Mean Time to Vehicles $\leqslant 49$ versus Vehicle MTBF



Figure 11/Systems Mean Duration of (Vehicle $\leqslant 49$) versus Vehicle MTBF

failure dominates. The mean duration of $N_0 \leqslant 49$ is insensitive to the variation in vehicle MTBF since with spare vehicles available to replace the failed ones, this index is more or less determined by the mean time to retrieve.

8.2/Sensitivity of Reliability Indices to the Mean Time to Repair a Vehicle (MTTR)

The effect of variation in vehicle MTTR on the reliability indices of the system is shown in Figures 12-14. The probability and the mean duration of $N_0 \leqslant 49$ decrease with the increase in the MTTR and the mean time to encounter $N_0 \leqslant 49$ correspondingly increases. For s = 0, the mean time to encounter $N_0 \leqslant 49$ is relatively insensitive to the MTTR. This is because in this case the system behaves more or less like a series system and the mean time to encounter $N_0 \leqslant 49$ is controlled by the vehicle MTBF (both partial and retrieval mode). The sensitivity of the indices to the vehicle MTTR also depends on the ratio of the spare vehicles to the operating vehicles. The higher the ratio, the less sensitive the indices are to MTTR [11] because with the spare vehicles available to replace the failed ones, the retrieval time dominates the time to repair.

Figure 12/System Probability of Vehicles $\leqslant 49$ versus MTTR of a Vehicle





Figure 13/System Mean Time to Vehicle $\leqslant 49$ versus Vehicle MTTR



Figure 14/System Mean Duration of Vehicles $\leqslant 49$ versus Vehicle MTTR

8.3/Effect of Spare Vehicles

Figure 15 shows the effect of the number of spares on the reliability indices. As expected, system reliability improves by having spare vehicles. After a certain number of spares, the effect is, however, incremental small and this number may be termed as the "infinite spare capacity" for the system, as there is little improvement beyond this point.

8.4/Effect of Entraining Vehicles

A study on the effect of entraining is given in Reference 11. The process of entraining vehicles modifies the modes of failure by converting some retrieval mode failures into partial modes and introducing some additional elements (such as couplers and trainlines) for failure.

Figure 15/Effect of the Number of Spare Vehicles on System Reliability Indices


MEAN TIME TO VEHICLES ⩽ 49
MEAN DURATION OF VEHICLES ⩽ 49
PROBABILITY OF VEHICLES ⩽ 49
NUMBER OF OPERATING VEHICLES = 50
VEHICLE MTBF = 5000 h
MEAN TIME TO RETRIEVE = 0.5 h
MEAN MAINTENANCE TIME = 3.5 h
s = SPARE VEHICLE
m = ON-MAINTENANCE VEHICLE
NUMBER OF SPARES

9/Concluding Remarks

9.1/Effect of Peak and Off-Peak Periods

The state space reliability models for track-bound transit systems have been described and the calculation of the system and demand based reliability measures discussed. This work was originally carried out for application to a single loop configuration, however, the methodology can be applied to more complicated networks.

Since these models were developed for application to a demonstration project, the effect of peak and off-peak periods was ignored. Therefore these models can find direct application for demonstration, airport, or downtown people-mover systems where the ratio of peak to off-peak periods is closer to unity.

There are two ways of including the effect of peak and off-peak periods:

1/ If it can be assumed that all the failed vehicles over the previous day have been repaired by the following morning so that the initial probability vector every morning is the same, the models can be solved in a time specific manner over the peak and off-peak periods. This involves the solution of differential equations instead of the linear equations for the state probabilities.

2/ The models can be modified to include the effect of peak and off-peak periods. The approach outlined in item 1 above is, however, simpler to implement.

9.2/Simulation versus Analytical Method

As the transit systems considered become more complex, the analytical techniques become more difficult to apply. Simulation using Monte Carlo techniques can be used to perform the reliability analysis of track-bound systems. The simulation method is conceptually easy to apply but could be quite expensive for sensitivity studies. Sometimes it may be possible to apply a hybrid approach such as partial solution by analytical methods and part by simulation. For example, the system base probabilities may be calculated by analytical models and the probabilities of delays by specific system deficiencies calculated by simulation and the two results combined to yield demand based measures.

9.3/Failure Data

Subsystem failure rate is an important input parameter for transit system reliability modelling and calculation. For transit systems using newer technologies, these figures are usually synthesized from part failure rates available from handbooks or other data collection and exchange programs. Though such information on conventional transit systems could be available from field experience, no collective effort at a national or international level has been visible in this regard. A data collection and analysis activity to fulfill this need has been carried out by the author and a colleague and the results are available in a separate report [12].

9.4/Further Work

The simulation techniques are conceptually simpler for calculating the reliability measures but consume considerable computer time, especially when performing sensitivity studies. The analytical methods become quite complicated when applied to complex system configurations but are very suitable for sensitivity analysis. There is a need for further development of the analytical and simulation methods for application to more complex network configurations, taking into account the peak and off-peak periods and including demand in deriving suitable measures of reliability.

10/References

1. C. Singh, R. Billinton, *System Reliability Modelling and Evaluation,* Hutchinson Educational, 1977, London.
2. C. Singh, "Reliability Models for Track-Bound Transit Systems", Proceedings 1977 Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium.
3. C. Singh, "Some Reliability Data on Conventional Transit Vehicles", internal report Nov. 1974, Transit Systems Research and Development, M.T.C.
4. M.E. Westmoreland, "Reliability Improvement of Land Vehicles", Proceedings 1973 Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium.
5. C. Singh, "Operational Reliability Analysis", internal report Feb. 1975, Transit Systems Research and Development, M.T.C.
6. E.L. Welker and H.H. Buchanan, "Safety – Availability Study Methods Applied to BART", Proceedings 1975 Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium.
7. E.L. Welker, "Reliability and Availability Assessment Criteria, Data Inputs and Analysis Methods for Mass Transit Systems", Proceedings 1976 Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium.
8. D. Heiman, "Availability – Concepts and Definitions", Proceedings 1976 Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium.
9. R. Billinton, C. Singh, "Frequency and Duration Method of Generating Capacity Reliability Evaluation", Presented at the EIC Annual General Meeting, Quebec City, Sept. 1971.
10. C. Singh, "Computer Program for Reliability Analysis of Track-Bound Transit Systems", Transit Systems Research and Development, M.T.C.
11. C. Singh, et al, "Transit System Reliability", Presented at 2nd Intersociety Transportation Conference, Denver, Colorado (1973).
12. C. Singh and M.D. Kankam, "Reliability Data and Analysis for Transit Vehicles", Transit Systems Research and Development, M.T.C., Feb. 1977.

11/Notation

$P_i(t)$	The probability of being in state i at time t
P_i	$P_i(t)$ as $t \to \infty$
$P(x)$	Probability of event x
λ_{ij}	Transition rate from state i to state j
S	System state space
X^+	A subset of system states defining an event or a mode of degradation
X^-	A disjoint subset to X^+ i.e., $X^- = S - X^+$
P_+	Probability of being in X^+
f_+	Frequency of encountering X^+
$f(x)$	Frequency of encountering event x
T_+	Mean time between successive encounters of X^+
d_+	Mean duration of stay in X^+ in one cycle
$P_D(x_1,x_2)$	Probability of incurring delay $> x_1$ and $< x_2$
$\lambda_{i1},\lambda_{i2}$	Retrieval and partial mode failure rates of the ith component of the vehicle
μ_r	Vehicle retrieval rate
μ_p	Partial failure recovery rate
μ_i	Repair rate of the ith component of the vehicle
λ_1	Retrieval mode failure rate of the vehicle
μ	Repair rate of the vehicle
N_{ST}	Total number of passenger stations
N_o	Number of operating vehicles
λ_s,μ_s	Station lane failure and repair rates
λ_e,μ_e	Express lane failure and repair rates
N0,N1	Number of type A and type B stations, respectively
λ_{ss},μ_{ss}	Power substation failure and repair rate